

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated November 29, 2005. Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-20 have been rejected. Claims 8 and 10 have been objected to. Claims 1, 2, and 15 are the independent claims. Claim 18 has been amended but no new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lo (U.S. Patent No. 4,539,677; hereinafter "Lo"). The Office Action rejected Claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action also rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action also objected to Claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) as introducing new matter that is not supported by the original disclosure. Claims 8 and 10 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action also noted that a proper IDS complying with 37 CFR 1.98 for the references has not been filed with the Patent Office. A copy has been filed and courtesy copy is included for the Examiner. Furthermore, the Examiner objected to the Abstract in that the Abstract did not commence on a separate sheet of paper. With this response to Office Action, Applicant has included an Abstract that starts on a separate piece of paper in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4).

The Office Action rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that it was not clear what the Applicant was attempting to claim by "timer logic a timer." Applicant has amended Claim 18 and now believes Claim 18 to no longer be indefinite.

The Office Action rejected Claims 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and the Examiner further objected under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) that Claims 14 and 19 introduced new matter that is not supported by the original disclosure. Applicant traverses this rejection and objection because the subject matter of Claims 14 and 19 are fully supported by Applicant's specification and therefore do not add any new matter. With respect to Claim 14, the Examiner stated that "is in accordance with a minimal time interval ensured by the data bus protocol for an inactive state of the data bus" was not supported by the specification and that with respect to Claim 19 that "is in accordance with a time interval ensured by the data bus protocol for an inactive state to arise on the data bus" is also not supported by the specification and therefore new matter. The Applicant directs the Examiner to Applicant's specification on page 7, lines 23-26 which states that "[s]uch a permanently active state of the transmission line TXD during a predetermined time interval should not occur in a accordance with the data bus protocol, because an inactive state of the data bus within certain minimal time intervals is ensured by this protocol." A person having ordinary skill in the art would understand bus protocols and the inherencies involved in bus protocols and that the above quoted section from Applicant's specification would provide support for both Claims 14 and 19. Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the §132(a) objection and the §112, first paragraph rejection of Claims 14 and 19 because Applicant's specification provides support for and enables such claim terms and are therefore not new matter.

The Office Action also rejected Claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and the Examiner further objected under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) that Claims 15-20 introduced new matter that is not supported by the original disclosure. Applicant traverses this rejection and objection because the subject matter of Claims 15-20 is fully supported by Applicant's specification and therefore does not add any new matter. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the claims terms "error management logic," "determination logic," and "signal logic" are not supported by the specification and are therefore new matter. The Applicant directs the Examiner to Applicant's specification page 6, lines 25-27, page 7, lines 4-14, and the sole Figure. The sole Figure and the above cited sections refer to means 1 for error management which includes at least five logic components including AND gates 11, 15, and 17, OR gate 13, and flip-flop 14 and provides the functionality of monitoring the signals of the transmission and receiving lines, determining whether the data bus lines are in one state when the receiving line simultaneously signals the bus is in an opposite state, and providing an error signal. For instance, an "output of the D flip-flop supplies an error signal F" which corresponds to the signal logic in Claim 15 which "provides an error signal. A person having ordinary skill in the art would examine the sole Figure and above cited sections of Applicant's specification and understand and be enabled to practice Applicant's invention as called out in Claims 15-20. Thus Applicant respectfully traverses the §132(a) objection and the §112, first paragraph rejection of Claims 15-20 because Applicant's specification provides support for and enables such claim terms and are therefore not new matter.

Furthermore, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lo. But Lo fails to recite, teach, or suggest a transceiver for a serial data bus wherein the transceiver includes "means for error management which means supplies an error signal when it recognizes that the data bus lines are active and that the receiving


line simultaneously signals an inactive bus,” as recited by Applicant’s Claim 1 and “means for error management, which means comprise a timer circuit which triggers an error signal when the transmission line is active for a longer period than a predetermined time interval, which error signal is cancelled when both the transmission line is inactive and the receiving line is active,” as recited by Applicant’s Claim 2. The Examiner relies upon Lo column 2, lines 6-52 and Figures 7 and 8 to anticipate Applicant’s Claim 1 and 2. But Lo column 2, lines 6-52 discloses a method for providing or suppressing an interrupt based on bus availability and activity and does not disclose a transceiver with means for error management. Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the §102(b) rejection of Claims 1 and 2 over Lo because the reference fails to recite or suggest every limitation of Applicant’s Claims 1 and 2.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner stating that Claims 8 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3-8 and 10-13 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 9 and 14 depend from independent Claim 2, and Claims 16-20 depend from independent Claim 15 discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicant further believes the §102 and §112 rejections of Claims 3-14 and 16-20 to be moot in light of the above remarks and request their withdrawal.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims over the references cited, and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Adam L. Stroud,
Reg. No. 48,410
Attorney
(408) 474-9064
January 10, 2006